

### Remarks

Claims 2, 11 and 17 are canceled herein. Claims 1, 3, 10, 12, 16 and 20 are amended herein. Claims 1, 3-10, 12-16 and 18-20 remain pending in the Application.

### Rejection under 102(e)

#### Claims 1- 9 and 16-20

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-9 and 16-20 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Meadows et al. (6690292). Applicant has reviewed Meadows et al. and respectfully states that Meadows et al. do not anticipate the present invention for the following rationale.

Regarding Claim 1, Applicant respectfully states that Claim 1 includes the feature “a control module coupled with said access module, said control module for limiting said personalized content server system to receive only the vehicle traffic report content as specified by said personal preferences of said user from said at least one remote content server.” Support for the Claimed features can be found throughout the Specification including Paragraphs [0041] and [0030] as well as Figures 1 and 2.

Applicant respectfully disagrees that Meadows et al. anticipates the feature of Claim 1. Applicant understands Meadows et al. to provide a server with a plurality of sensors and a client/customer database therein for utilization with a subscription service, e.g., for maintaining a list of subscribers to the traffic monitoring system. In addition, Applicant understands Meadows et al. to teach that a customer’s customized traffic information is provided from the server directly to the subscriber’s browser.

Applicant respectfully states that the teachings of Meadows et al. do not anticipate a third party “personalized content server system” which would operate between the client device and the server. Therefore, Applicant respectfully states

that Meadows et al. does not anticipate the features as claimed in Independent Claim 1.

Regarding Claim 16, Applicant respectfully states that Claim 16 includes the feature “a control module coupled with said access module, said control module for limiting said personalized content server system to receive only the Internet application content as specified by said personal preferences of said user from said plurality of remote content servers.” Support for the Claimed features can be found throughout the Specification including Paragraphs [0041] and [0030] as well as Figures 1 and 2.

As stated herein, Applicant respectfully disagrees that Meadows et al. anticipates the feature of Claim 16. Applicant understands Meadows et al. to provide a server with a plurality of sensors and a client/customer database therein for utilization with a subscription service, e.g., for maintaining a list of subscribers to the traffic monitoring system. In addition, Applicant understands Meadows et al. to teach that a customer’s customized traffic information is provided from the server directly to the subscriber’s browser.

Applicant respectfully states that the teachings of Meadows et al. do not anticipate a third party “personalized content server system” which would operate between the client device and the server. Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that Meadows et al. does not anticipate the features as claimed in Independent Claim 16.

In addition, Applicant respectfully states that the teachings of Meadows et al. do not anticipate the feature “an access module that accesses a plurality of remote content servers.” That is, Applicant understands Meadows et al. to anticipate the user accessing a single server not accessing a plurality of servers. In addition, Applicant does not understand Meadows et al. to anticipate culling information from a plurality of server’s sources.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Meadows et al. does not anticipate the present claimed invention as recited in Claims 1 and 16, and as such, Claims 1 and 16 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant also respectfully submits that Meadows et al. does not anticipate the present claimed invention as recited in Claims 3-9 and 18-20 which are dependent on allowable Independent Claims 1 and 16 and that Claims 3-9 and 18-20 recite further features of the present claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that Claims 3-9 and 18-20 are allowable as pending from allowable base Claims.

#### Rejection under 103(a)

##### Claims 10-15

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 10-15 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meadows et al. in view of Wynblatt et al. (6,546,421). Applicant has reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submits that the present invention is not rendered obvious over Meadows et al. in view of Wynblatt et al. for the following rationale.

Regarding Claim 10, Applicant respectfully states that Claim 10 includes the feature “a control module coupled with said access module, said control module for limiting said personalized content server system to receive only the Internet radio content as specified by said personal preferences of said user from said plurality of remote content servers.” Support for the Claimed features can be found throughout the Specification including Paragraphs [0041] and [0030] as well as Figures 1 and 2.

As the Examiner has stated, Meadows et al. fails to teach the vehicle traffic report content is an Internet radio content.

However, Applicant respectfully disagrees that Meadows et al. teaches or renders obvious the feature of Claim 10. Applicant understands Meadows et al. to provide a server with a plurality of sensors and a client/customer database therein for utilization with a subscription service, e.g., for maintaining a list of subscribers to the traffic monitoring system. In addition, Applicant understands Meadows et al. to teach that a customer's customized traffic information is provided from the server directly to the subscriber's browser.

Applicant respectfully states that the teachings of Meadows et al. do not render obvious a third party "personalized content server system" which would operate between the client device and the server. Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that Meadows et al. does not teach the features as claimed in Independent Claim 10.

In addition, Applicant respectfully states that the teachings of Meadows et al. do not render obvious the feature "an access module that accesses a plurality of remote content servers." That is, Applicant understands Meadows et al. to teach the user accessing a single server not accessing a plurality of servers. In addition, Applicant does not understand Meadows et al. to teach nor render obvious culling information from a plurality of server's sources. Instead Applicant understands Meadows et al. to teach the server is a single source of data and does not teach or suggest utilizing a plurality of servers to receive a plurality of data from different sources.

Applicant has reviewed the teaching of Wynblatt et al. and does not find the teachings of Wynblatt et al. overcome the shortcomings of Meadows et al. Moreover, Applicant understands Wynblatt et al. to teach a user limiting the Internet radio reception to a user list of favorite Internet radio stations. This teaches away from the features of Claim 10 which do not teach limiting the servers or Internet stations accessed but instead limiting the content received from a plurality of servers.

Therefore, the present invention does not limit the servers or Internet radio sources being accessed, but instead utilizes the personalized content server system to limit the content received from the servers or Internet radio sources. Therefore, unlike the teaching of Wynblatt et al. the servers accessed by the user are not decreased and may in fact be increased. It is the content received from the servers and Internet radio providers that is limited or filtered.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Meadows et al. alone or in combination with Wynblatt et al. does not teach or render obvious the present claimed invention as recited in Claim 10, and as such, Claims 10 is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant also respectfully submits that Meadows et al. alone or in combination with Wynblatt et al. does not teach or render obvious the present claimed invention as recited in Claims 12-15 which are dependent on allowable Independent Claim 10 and that Claims 12-15 recite further features of the present claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that Claims 12-15 are allowable as pending from allowable base Claims.

Conclusion

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of Claims 1, 3-10, 12-16 and 18-20.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,  
Wagner, Murabito & Hao LLP

Date: 6/15/05

  
\_\_\_\_\_

John P. Wagner, Jr.  
Reg. No. 35,398

Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, California 95113  
(408) 938-9060